REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Final Office Action mailed on March 9, 2010, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 12, and 15-17 are amended, and no claims are canceled or added; as a result, claims 1-17 are now pending in this application.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Suryawanshi for participating in a telephone interview on May 4, 2010. During the interview, Applicant and the Examiner discussed proposed amendments to independent claim 1 which could overcome the § 103 rejection contained in the Final Office Action mailed on March 9, 2010. Although no agreement was reached regarding specific claim amendment language, Applicant believes the discussion was helpful in moving this case forward toward allowance.

§ 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-2, 4-6, and 8-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over David et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,101) in view of Hughes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,109,484). Applicant has amended the independent claims. Insofar as the rejection still applies, Applicant respectfully traverses as follows.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, in part:

> collecting configuration information for the target computer prior to transmitting any operating system image to the target computer from a predetermined server, wherein the configuration information includes a blade slot location, a storage disk size, a network location identifier, a role identifier, and a user identifier

Independent claim 6, as amended, recites, in part:

> at least one target computer configured to respond to initialization by requesting a network address for communication over the network, respond to receiving the network address by requesting a boot file over the network, respond to receiving the boot file by executing the boot file in a pre-operating system environment to create a

client agent, where the client agent is configured to perform an inventory of the target computer to collect configuration data and transmit the configuration data in a request for an operating system image to a predetermined server, wherein the client is configured to perform the inventory and to collect configuration data of the target computer prior to transmitting any operating system image to the target computer from the predetermined server and the configuration data includes a blade slot location, a storage disk size, a network location identifier, a role identifier, and a user identifier

Independent claim 12, as amended, recites, in part:

collecting policy criteria data for the target computer prior to transmitting any operating system image to the target computer from an operating system management server, wherein the policy criteria data includes a blade slot location, a storage disk size, a network location identifier, a role identifier, and a user identifier

Independent claim 16, as amended, recites, in part:

means for collecting configuration information for the target computer in a pre-operating system environment, wherein the configuration information for the target computer is collected prior to transmitting any operating system image to the target computer from a predetermined server and the configuration information includes a blade slot location, a storage disk size, a network location identifier, a role identifier, and a user identifier

Support for the amendments can be found in Applicant's specification as originally filed at, for example, paragraphs 0032 and 0036, and claims 4, 10, and 15.

From Applicant's review of the David and Hughes references, the references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 6, 12, and 16, as amended. For example, the David and Hughes references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-quoted elements of independent claims 1, 6, 12, and 16, as amended.

For example, the David reference appears to teach a boot process for a computer, e.g., an Open Modular Controller (OMC), in which information relevant to the boot process is read from the computer and sent to a server. (Column 3, lines 57-59; column 4, lines 32-34 and 54-55). The David reference appears to teach that the

relevant information includes the serial number from the computer and hardware information from the computer, such as memory capacity, I/O cards installed, processor speed, and firmware versions. (Column 4, lines 55-60).

Hence, the David reference appears to teach collecting information for the computer that includes the serial number from the computer and hardware information from the computer, such as memory capacity, I/O cards installed, processor speed, and firmware versions. However, the David reference does not teach that the collected information includes a blade slot location, a storage disk size, a network location identifier, a role identifier, or a user identifier.

Further, the Hughes reference appears to teach a data processing system in which a terminal acquires an operating program from a controller over a network. (Column 2, lines 42-43 and 64-66; Figure 1). The Hughes reference appears to teach that the terminal acquires the operating program by performing a configuration routine in which the terminal determines the I/O devices attached to the terminal. (Column 2, line 67, through column 3, line 2). The Hughes reference appears to teach that the terminal then downloads the appropriate programs for running, e.g., operating, the terminal from a controller. (Column 3, lines 2-3).

Hence, the Hughes reference appears to teach that the configuration information used by the terminal to acquire the operating program includes the I/O devices attached to the terminal. However, the Hughes reference does not teach that the configuration information includes a blade slot location, a storage disk size, a network location identifier, a role identifier, or a user identifier.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the David and Hughes references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 6, 12, and 16, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of independent claims 1, 6, 12, and 16, as well as those claims that depend therefrom.

Claims 3, 7, and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over David et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,101) and Hughes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,109,484) in view of Burkhardt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,642). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1, and claim 7 depends from independent claim 6. For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that the David and Hughes references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1 and 6, as amended.

From Applicant's review of the Burkhardt reference, the Burkhardt reference does not cure the deficiencies of the David and Hughes references. For instance, the David, Hughes, and Burkhardt references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest:

> collecting configuration information for the target computer prior to transmitting any operating system image to the target computer from a predetermined server, <u>wherein the configuration information includes a blade slot location, a storage disk size, a network location identifier, a role identifier, and a user identifier</u>

as recited in independent claim 1, as amended, or:

> at least one target computer configured to respond to initialization by requesting a network address for communication over the network, respond to receiving the network address by requesting a boot file over the network, respond to receiving the boot file by executing the boot file in a pre-operating system environment to create a client agent, where the client agent is configured to perform an inventory of the target computer to collect configuration data and transmit the configuration data in a request for an operating system image to a predetermined server, wherein the client is configured to perform the inventory and to collect configuration data of the target computer prior to transmitting any operating system image to the target computer from the predetermined server and <u>the configuration data includes a blade slot location, a storage disk size, a network location identifier, a role identifier, and a user identifier</u>

as recited in independent claim 6, as amended.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the the David, Hughes, and
Burkhardt references, alone or in combination. do not teach or suggest:

collecting configuration information for the target computer prior to
transmitting any operating system image to the target computer from a
predetermined server, wherein the configuration information includes a
blade slot location, a storage disk size, a network location identifier, a
role identifier, and a user identifier

as recited in independent claim 17, as amended.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the David, Hughes, and Burkhardt
references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of
dependent claims 3 and 7. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the David,
Hughes, and Burkhardt references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest
each and every element of independent claim 17, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant
respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 3,
7, and 17.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Jake Kern at (612) 236-0125.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The
undersigned hereby certifies that this
correspondence is being electronically filed with
the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
on this _10th_ day of _May_____, 2010.

Alison L. Sulonda
Name

_C. X._
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Joseph J. Fitzgerald, et al.

By Applicants' Representatives,
Brooks, Cameron & Huebsch, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By:_____
Jake Kern
Reg. No. 58,666

Date: _2010 - 05 - 09_____